

Vol. 15 No 2 February 1990

Edited, printed and published at Liverpool
 by Dr J.Pinsent & Ms Helena Hurt, BA
 Dept of Classics and Archaeology, The University,
 P.O. Box 147 Liverpool, L69 3BX, Tel. 051-794-2455
 RATES for 1990, 10 issues (not August and September)
 UK & Europe, £15.00, elsewhere \$US 30.00
 Retired & Student, £10.00 or \$US 20.00.



CONTENTS of which the authors retain the copyright.
 The editor retains copyright in the format

T. Fear (Durham): <i>Catullus, a poet in transition</i>	18-24
Joan M. Frayn (Kingston upon Thames): <i>Quality control in Roman agriculture</i>	24-26
A. S. Gratwick (St. Andrews): <i>Diminishing returns: Plautus, Menaechmi 1161</i>	27-28
David Harvey (Exeter): <i>The silent woman of Lydia: Manisa Museum inv.5414 line 15</i>	28-29
D. N. Levin (Rice U., Houston): <i>dormitant commentatores Heliodori</i>	29
Graham Ley (Auckland): <i>On military discipline</i>	30-31
S. Douglas Olson (Howard U., Washington D.C.): <i>Dicaeopolis and Aristophanes in Acharnians</i>	31-32
M. R. Wright (Reading): <i>New wine in new bottles: Cicero de finibus 3.4.15</i>	32

The late despatch of 'the January number of *LCM*' was further compounded by the 'flu which those in this country will not need telling has been ravaging it, and the staff of *LCM* over Christmas, New Year and Epiphany. The Editor used to take a perverse pleasure in the fact that *LCM* was, he thought, a one man band. He was warned by a fellow publisher that this would not be possible as subscriptions approached the 500 mark, and subscribers will not need reminding how far behind had fallen the administration before the EA came to the rescue. Even so, *LCM* realised this year how susceptible it still is to the vagaries of fortune. Invoices should accompany this number, but if for any reason they have not, subscribers are invited to remit, as some of them have already, on the basis of the rates sheet they received at the end of last year.

The Editor's occasional pessimism about the future of our discipline was reinforced when he read the contribution of Professor Arnott to *La filologia greca e latina nel secolo xx*, the 2 volume publication of the *Atti del Congresso Internazionale* held in Rome in 1984, though he is reminded by Professor Arnott that his paper was written 'when we were at our lowest trough' and that 'at the moment the situation seems slightly better'.

However, in 1984 he wrote, that even if George Orwell's most pessimistic predictions for that year had not yet been fulfilled 'a dismal shadow hangs over future prospects for teachers and students of the ancient classics in our universities'. He notes the paradox that 'works of high scholarship continue to be published in greater quantities perhaps than ever before' and cites with approval E.R.Dodd's remark (*Missing Persons*, 1977, 172) that 'If the love and knowledge of Greek literature ever die in this country they will die of a suffocation arising from its exponents' industry', concedes that 'about thirty universities in Britain still teach Greek, and that students still turn up each October fired with enthusiasm to begin or continue their love affairs with the language and literature of ancient Greece' (the Editor hopes that we fan rather than quench that enthusiasm by the way we teach and examine the subject). But Professor Arnott's final sentence then was 'Even so Greek is becoming more and more a rare and freakish subject, and its study is dying. The future looks bleak, and often morale sinks low'.

But what, if anything, should we do about it? The Editor's pessimistic solution at one time was: batten down the hatches; retire to academic monasteries; keep the subject alive in all its rigour against a future renaissance. But, as he was told, 'it's all right for you, you're retiring', and more positive advice has been given in two quarters: Professor Easterling's Presidential address to the Classical Association, and Peter Jones' account in the first number of *CA News* of The Co-ordinating Committee for Classics (CCC) of which he is the Spokesman. 'We are,' he says, 'in other words, a pressure group', and the Editor of *CA News* adds to his account of the more urgent words 'It is absolutely vital for the survival of Classics that we conduct an effective publicity campaign, so do send Peter Jones news of anything on the Classics that might catch the Press's interest, or that might be built up into a national story'.

This Editor supposes that most if not all readers of *LCM* also receive *CA News*, or know the address of Peter Jones. In case there are any who do not, it is Classics at the University of Newcastle upon Tyne, NE1 7RU. It may well be that overseas readers of *LCM* may also have something on this subject that they can contribute to Peter Jones or to the Editor.

A reader has provided bibliographical details of the UK paperback edition of M. Herzfeld, *The Poetics of Manhood*, reviewed in the January number by H.A. Forbes. It is ISBN 0-691-10244-9, £15.50, and the Editor is grateful for this repair of his omission.



T. Fear (Durham): *Catullus, a poet in transition*.

LCM 15.2 (Feb.1990), 18-26

Catullus' 'Lesbia' poems are those that make the most immediate impact on the modern reader, and there has been a tendency to see Catullus as a poet of 'primitive passion'. E.A. Havelock (p.182) wrote in 1939 that 'the former [Horace's *Odes*] are exclusively a work of the intellect, the latter [Catullus' poems] were born from the heart – a classic case of the critic seeing what he wants to see rather than what is actually there. Catullus 64, 400 lines long with the story of Peleus and Thetis encircling that of Theseus and Ariadne, depicted on the coverlet, in a notable piece of Ring Composition, and 67, a dialogue between a man and a door, are hardly spontaneous emotional outpourings. But if Havelock's quotation were to be rewritten, with the former referring to Catullus' longer and the latter to his shorter poems, it might fit a popular interpretation of Catullus' poetry. But even so it would suggest too neat a dichotomy.

Catullus was writing when Callimachean ideals were influential, emphasising intellectual rather than emotional qualities, poetic art as an exact science rather than the mirror of personal experience. But Catullus' 'Lesbia' poems show a poet used to working in a highly intellectual and largely impersonal medium faced with an emotional crisis in his own life. The tension that arises as the rational intellectual tries to understand the power of his irrational feelings results in highly intelligent and subtle love poetry: Catullus never wholly compromises his intellect or surrenders totally to the experience and expression of his emotions.

Nobody doubts the emotion in the 'Lesbia' poems: but let us examine their intellectual content, first briefly considering poem 1, and introductory epigram though we cannot be sure that the collection which it introduced was that which we now possess¹. It is, however, like other first poems in collections (e.g. Propertius 1.1, which begins with the word *Cynthia*), likely to be programmatic, so that we may expect to learn from it something of the nature of Catullus' poetry.

In line 1 *libellum* is suggestive of the Callimachean *tenuis Musa*. It can be taken in two ways, referring either to the book as object or to its contents, and similarly the phrases

¹ For more detailed reading on this poem cf. Copley 1951, 200-206; Elder 1966, 143-9; Singleton 1972, 192-196.

attached to it, *lepidum nouum* (1) and *arida modo pumice expolitum* (2) can refer to either, and *arida* in particular is obviously suggestive of Callimachean polish. In 3 and 4 *esse aliquid* and *nugas* appear to be colloquial: *nugas* in Plautus means simply 'rubbish' or 'worthless scraps' and is not used technically for light verse before Martial. But Catullus is being ironical, it is not he who thinks his poems worthless but the general public, and Callimachean poets are not concerned with the opinion of the public, they take the sidestreets and not the highways. Nor is it likely that in 5 and 6 Catullus is criticising Cornelius Nepos: there is no point in abusing the dedicatee, and if the lines sound a little pompous it is because of the immensity of the task. To condense world history *tribus . . . chartis* (6) is in keeping with Callimachean ideals, and *doctis* and *laboriosis* (7) are complimentary rather than reproaches (cf. the nine years Cinna spent on his *Zmyrna*, 95.1). The return to irony in the last three lines, *quidquid hoc libelli | quaecumque* (8-9), *plus uno maneat perenne saeclo* (10) clearly indicate that Catullus does believe that he has produced something worthwhile.

Poem 1, then, tells us that Catullus' poetry is highly intellectual (the double meaning of *libellum*) and that it is not so much for popular taste as for men like Nepos who will appreciate it. It demonstrates both the allusiveness and the polish characteristic of Callimachean poetry. It shows that Catullus was very much aware of Callimachean ideals, that his poetry was for him a very serious matter, as serious as any other aspect of life. Casual poets like Hortensius are legitimate targets for abuse because they refuse to respect the life of *otium* that was so important to Catullus. He is a man committed to his poetry and urbane lifestyle, a man whose emotions were volatile enough to lash out at any one who did not come up to his standards. It is this strange situation, that of a Callimachean sophisticate with strong emotions, that makes Catullus such an interesting poet to read, since the two different strands invariably cause conflict. Catullus never, even in his 'Lesbia' poetry, switches off his 'reason' to go into emotional overdrive; his reason is never more than one short step away.

It is the 'Lesbia' poems which have earned Catullus the tag 'poet of passion', and it is ironic that it is precisely in his dealings with Lesbia that Catullus reveals the rational side of his nature. Poem 51 is often taken as the first 'Lesbia' poem and so we will consider it first. The fourth stanza is often taken as spurious and as ruining what is otherwise a very good translation of Sappho. It is, however, essential to an understanding of the poem, and it tells us some very interesting things about Catullus. Even if it was the first written to Lesbia (and a clever translation of Sappho was just the sort of poem that a cultivated person would have appreciated), it is notable that *Catulle* is addressed (13) as well as *Lesbia* (8).

First, the choice of a translation of an erotic poem by Sappho is not in keeping with spontaneous passionate response. Catullus may have felt as Sappho did in the original, but that actual process of translating the poem neatly into Latin was one that required care and intellect. The aim was to win Lesbia's attention as much by her recognition of his intellectual qualities as of his passionate interest. For if the latter had been his only aim he would have had no need to go to the trouble of translating Sappho. Second, the fact that Catullus addresses himself in the poem tells us something often overlooked in considering love poetry, that is, that the poet is primarily concerned with himself. The tendency is to assume that Catullus is writing about Lesbia, but he is not, he is writing about his own emotions and feelings for which Lesbia may be only a catalyst. We learn what little we know about Lesbia only through Catullus' feelings for her.

Poem 51, then, displays a line of thought that is ultimately rational rather than passionate, and this is where the fourth stanza is so important. If in the first three stanzas Catullus is experiencing the classic symptoms of love, speechlessness, a fiery tingling, ringing in the ears, misty vision, in the last he returns to an objective view of this subjective experience. *Otium* is the way of life that Catullus has chosen, the renunciation of a traditional Roman public career and the choice of 'poetry' as a way of life. But this *otium* is *molestum* (13); *otio exsultas nimiumque gestis* (14). Catullus senses that he is becoming too immersed in it; he realises that being in love is a two-sided coin, there is pleasure but there is also pain, and there may even be pain in the pleasure. A strange confession for a 'poet of passion'! But it is not that

Catullus is going completely to renounce his way of life, but he realises the problems in a way that we may think a 'romantic' poet intoxicated with emotion has no right to do.

Indeed it is remarkable how many of the 'Lesbia' poems are concerned either with Catullus trying to break away from Lesbia or with the aftermath of the break. First, poem 8. This poem depends for its effect on the conflict between Catullus' feelings and his common sense. He realises that Lesbia is a thing of the past, and this poem is an attempt to accept the fact. The last line, *at tu Catulle, destinatus obdura* (19) recalls the first, *miser Catulle, desinas ineptire* (1; note the play on *desinas* and *destinatus*), and *obdura* also connects with lines 11-12, *sed obstinata mente perfer, obdura. | vale, puella. iam Catullus obdurat* (where note the play on *obstinata* and *obdura*).

The main theme of the poem is thus clear. Catullus must harden himself to make the break with Lesbia easier and final. But theory is one thing and practice another. As soon as Catullus leaves the resolution of the first two lines he drifts from the present to the past, to remember how things once were. The description of the good times is framed by two nearly identical lines, differing only in one word: *fulsere quondam* (3: *vere* 8) *candidi tibi soles*. Now things have changed: *nunc iam illa non uult* (9), and if Lesbia does not want Catullus, then Catullus must not want Lesbia either: *tu quoque impotens noli, | nec quae fugit sectare, nec miser uiue* (9-10). This is common sense. If Catullus is not *miser uiuere* he must forget Lesbia, and if the poem had ended at line 13 we would suspect that he had succeeded. But the following lines show that Catullus is far from being 'over' Lesbia. *scelesta* (15) shows his bitterness, love turns to hate (cf. *odi et amo*, poem 85), and there follows a series of short questions. Lesbia will be sad (*dolebis* 14) because now there will be nobody to kiss her or love her or say she is beautiful (16-18). But the last line of the poem, and the return to resolution, show that Catullus is aware of the reality of the situation. Lesbia is not grieving or about to grieve: the grief is Catullus', and the short questions only remind him of what he is missing. He knows very well that it is absurd to say *nulla* when everybody will be asking her except Catullus.

The poem, then, is instructive in that it shows Catullus desperately trying to apply reason as a means of overcoming passion. It does not work too well, and that reflects on the strength of his feelings. But it is interesting to find this 'Horatian' technique in the 'poet of passion'.

Most of the poetry that Catullus writes about Lesbia is in fact characterised by an increasing awareness of the reality of the situation. Leaving aside the question whether she was actually Clodia Metella (for which historical literary problem cf. especially Wiseman 1969), Lesbia was doubtless beautiful and intelligent, and Catullus' attraction to her was natural enough. But she was also flirtatious, she was not the kind of woman upon whom a man could pin far-reaching hopes, she was concerned rather with the pleasures of the moment than with *aeternum hoc sanctae foedus amicitiae* (109.6). Catullus' position was, then, both impossible and painful. There was hardly a chance that he and Lesbia could become man and wife and live out their days in blissful contentment, and as long as Catullus still hoped that such might be the case he was bound for continual disappointment. It was his struggle to let his reason, his knowledge of what Lesbia was really like, overcome his feelings that produces his most memorable and moving poetry.

Poem 11 is often taken as the last poem Catullus wrote about Lesbia, as like 51 it is written in Sapphics², but this is not relevant to its understanding. The very first line of the poem, *Furi et Aureli, comites Catulli*, raises problems, for Furius and Aurelius appear also in poems 15, 16, 21 and 23, and in these the tone adopted towards them is hardly complimentary. But Catullus' relationship with them is important for a full understanding of this poem.

² References to Caesar's campaigns of 55 B.C. in lines 10-12 also date the poem, and the generally accepted date for Catullus' death is 54 B.C.. However, Catullus' dates are problematic, and we cannot be certain that it really is the last poem. Certainly it marks a rift between Catullus and Lesbia, but this may not have been the final one.

Neudling says (p.20) that 'Unless the poem was ironical, and there is no reason to suppose it was, it shows that Furius and Aurelius remained comrades of Catullus even if not intimate friends, to the end of his life'.

Now it is possible, but subject to doubt, that the abuse to which these two are subjected in the poems referred to above is merely that which is possible between good friends. But the whole poem is surely ironical and this irony may extend to the phrase *comites Catulli*. Its main irony, however, lies in the contrast between the first 14 lines and the next two. Furius and Aurelius are ready and willing – *omnia haec, quaecumque feret uoluntas | caelitum, temptare simul parati* (13-14), they will follow Catullus to the furthest East, to Arabia, Parthia, Gaul or that most desolate outpost, Britain (2-12). Some have suggested that the poem is unbalanced and that these three picturesque stanzas are out of place, but surely they are there to demonstrate the extravagance of the promises made by Furius and Aurelius. The irony is that all Catullus asks them is *pauca nuntiate meae puellae | non bona dicta*.

The ironic humour in this situation works whether Furius and Aurelius are friends or enemies, so this question may not be as important as at first appeared. The irony is heightened by the fact that they are not even going to have to do what Catullus asks, for the *non bona dicta* are actually contained in the poem itself. This sort of humorous irony is not what we imagine as consistent with the expression of strong passions. But after the banter, in the last two stanzas, the bitterness and anger are apparent, and the fact that Catullus realises the nature of Lesbia, *nullum amans uere, sed identidem omnium lilia rumpens* (19-20). The resignation of Catullus' love is apparent in the next line, *nec meum respectet, ut ante, amorem* (21), and the touching simile of the last three lines, where his past love for Lesbia is compared to a flower cut down by the passing ploughshare.

The poem, then, is a curious mixture of urbane irony, emotional outburst and resignation. But the pattern is clear: Catullus has finished with Lesbia, but even so his reason does not wholly overcome his emotions; he still feels angry, which proves that his resignation is not complete, and the simile of the flower suggests a self-pitying reflection rather than a determination to look forward. But Catullus, as in poem 51, is trying to apply reason, based on a realisation of Lesbia's true nature, to overcome emotion, and this increasing awareness of her character and his naïveté is apparent from poem 58, where the repetition of *Lesbia* (twice in the first line and once in the second) indicates his infatuation. The words show that Lesbia was always in his mind, and yet, what is this woman whom Catullus *plus quam se atque suos amauit omnes* (3)? Nothing but a common whore.

Another poem in this series is 76, of which many words and phrases recall poem 8 (*me miserum*, 19; *miser Catulle*, 8.1: *desinis esse miser*, 12; *desinas ineptire*, 8.1, *destinatus obdura*, 8.19, and *nec miser uiue*, 8.10). The whole poem is framed by the idea of Catullus' *pietas* (*cum se cogitat esse pium*, 2, and *pro pietate mea*, 26), and the imagery in 3-4, *nec sanctam uiolasse fidem, nec foedere in ullo | diuum ad fallendos numine abusum homines*, and 19, *si uitam puriter egi*, is striking as the language of religious devotion and observance. But of course Catullus is not talking about having led a life of devoted worship, but about never having done wrong to Lesbia, so that he should be able to take comfort from the fact that he at least, unlike Lesbia, was faithful (5-6 *multa parata manent in longa aetate, Catulle, | ex hoc ingrato gaudia amore tibi: ingrato* is picked up in line 9, *omnia quae ingratae perierunt credita menti*).

This is the rational approach, but it soon becomes clear in the poem that it is not working, as is shown by the two questions, *quare iam te cur amplius excrucies?* (10), and *quin tu animo affirmas atque istinc te ipse reducis, | et dis inuitis desinis esse miser?* (11-12). Catullus is clearly still miserable, and suffering in spite of his attempts to convince himself that he has acted rightly and so should be happy. He realises, however, that pursuit of the right course does not always bring instantaneous happiness. He can isolate the problem and the solution: *difficile est longum subito deponere amorem, | difficile est, uerum hoc qua lubet efficias: | una salus haec est, hoc est tibi peruincendum, | hoc facias, siue id non pote siue pote* (13-16). This is the rational side of Catullus, the ability to see what the problem is and the

solution, but his passionate side revolts against the solution and clings to the past. So Catullus, unable to help himself, makes an appeal to the gods, *o di, si uestrum est misereri, aut si quibus umquam | extremam iam ipsa in morte tulistis opem* (17-18). Rational principles are not helping Catullus because, as he realises, love is not a realistic force: *eripite hanc pestem perniciemque mihi, | quae mihi subrepens imos ut torpor in artus | expulit ex omni pectore laetitia* (20-22). It is interesting that the middle line here (21) is so reminiscent of 51.9-10 (*lingua sed torpet, tenuis sub artus | flamma demanat*). If 51 was the beginning of the affair then presumably 76 is near the end. At the beginning Catullus shows, in the fourth stanza of 51, that he recognises the pains of love, and this recognition remains all the way through to 76, where the pain remains and rationalisation cannot help. Catullus has ceased, he says, to hope that Lesbia will love him, and he realises that she will never be faithful (*non iam illud quaero, contra ut me diligat illa, | aut, quod non potis est, esse pudica uelit* (23-24); but the reality of the situation, as is so often the case, brings no comfort or release from pain.

This poem leads conveniently on to the 'Lesbia epigrams', in particular 70, 72, 75, 85, 87, 107, and 109. Catullus' use of the epigram, especially where Lesbia is concerned, seems to have been a new departure for Latin Poetry. It is put to very analytical use, for which the alternation of hexameter and pentameter to some extent suits it. It was a form suited for neat little antitheses, useful for funeral epitaphs and for praise. Catullus, however, used it to explore his feelings towards Lesbia. These epigrams are concerned almost exclusively with a rational approach: he is trying to define how he felt and why. This is not what is to be expected from a 'poet of passion', whom we, having been reared largely on 'romantic' poetry, feel should be busy experiencing the emotion rather than analysing it.

Sometimes this analysis is very prosaic, as for instance 72.3-4 (*dilexi tum te non tantum ut uulgus amicam, | sed pater ut gnatos diligit et generos*), where he loved Lesbia not so much as most people feel about a girlfriend but as a father feels for his sons and sons-in-law. The curious phrase is qualified by the last lines (7-8, *quod amantem iniuria talis | cogit amare magis, sed bene uelle minus*). Here *amare* surely means sexual passion, physical desire, and *bene uelle* affection. What Catullus is saying is that there was a time when he had both feelings for Lesbia, but that her promiscuity has destroyed his affection for her but if anything increased his sexual desire.

The same idea is expressed in the last two lines of poem 75 (*ut iam nec bene uelle queat tibi, si optima fias. | nec desistere amare, omnia si facias*, 3-4). Lesbia has wronged Catullus so badly that it is out of the question that he will feel any affection for her, but whatever she does he still feels physically attracted to her. There is, however, another important idea in this poem, and that is that it is not merely Lesbia's *culpa* that has ruined Catullus, but his *mens* also *ita se officio perdidit ipsa suo* (2). Catullus has destroyed himself too *suo officio*, a difficult phrase to translate into English: 'by its own dutifulness' or 'through a sense of respect' only half capture the meaning, which must be that Catullus has only himself to blame in expecting Lesbia to be what she could never be, and so the fault lies partly with himself. He has expected too much and built hopes on false assumptions.

Poem 109 demonstrates this point nicely. The first two lines are presumably something that Lesbia has said to Catullus: *iucundum, mea uita, mihi proponis amorem | hunc nostrum inter nos perpetuumque fore*. This is an erotic commonplace, and Lesbia probably intended it as such. But Catullus takes it seriously, and this leads him to the hope of the last two lines (3-4): *ut liceat nobis tota perducere uita | aeternum hoc sanctae foedus amicitiae* (for *foedus* cf. 76.3-4 above). But Lesbia had no such intentions: what a lover says is not always what is meant but often simply what seems appropriate.

Catullus seems to have learnt the lesson, albeit reluctantly, to judge from what he says in poem 70, where *mulier mea* must surely be Lesbia. *nulli se dicit mulier mea nubere malle | quam mihi, non si se Iuppiter ipse petat. | dicit: sed mulier cupido quod dicit amanti | in uento et rapida scribere oportet aqua*. Lesbia said she preferred Catullus to Jupiter. Both the repetition of *dicit* and the pause after *dicit* in the third line are important. The latter begins the contrast: that is what she said, but (*sed*) the reality is far different. Catullus realises his own

naive credulousness.

Catullus shows, then, an awareness of the reality of the situation, and acceptance of the situation may be said to be the death of romance. But it is seldom as clear cut as that. Catullus can analyse his feeling, analyse Lesbia's character and his own behaviour, and he does all this. But it does not help, as is clear from poem 85: *odi et amo. quare id faciam fortasse requiris. | nescio, sed fieri sentio et excrucior*. Catullus is in pain, he feels these contradictory emotions, but despite his self-analysis he is not really sure why.

Let us turn to the more lighthearted 'Lesbia' poems. Poem 5, and especially its first line, *uiuamus, mea Lesbia, atque amemus*, is often read almost as a hymn of joyful hedonism. But lines 4-6, *soles occidere et redire possunt; | nobis cum semel occidit breuis lux, | nox est perpetua una dormienda*, complicate this. Similar sentiments are later to be found in Horace, C.4.7.13-16, *damna tamen celeres reparant caelestia lunae: | nos, ubi decidimus | quo pater Aeneas, quo diues Tullus et Ancus, | puluis et umbra sumus*, and 1.11.6-8, . . . *et spatio breui | spem longam reseces. dum loquimur, fugerit inuida | aetas: carpe diem quam minimum credula postero*. The seemingly infinite cycle of nature makes us aware of the rigid, finite cycle of life. Such awareness leads the poet to draw as much as possible from the present moment (*carpe diem*). Hence the injunction by Catullus to Lesbia to ignore stern old men (2-3) and give him hundreds and thousands of kisses (10-13: these lines are probably a parody of the language of accountants, and thus connect with 2-3).

There are two ways of looking at poem 5, but both show the poet working rationally. We may take the message in lines 4-6 as heartfelt, and then the effect is to stir the poet to gain as much pleasure from the present as he can. Or we may see the line of thought as deliberately contrived to persuade Lesbia. He puts these gloomy thoughts into her head as a means of gaining her immediate attention. 'Moreover', he adds, 'if you don't want to be the centre of malicious gossip you had better kiss me thousands of times, so that anybody watching will lose count and will have nothing to talk about'. Such an argument is designed to get Catullus what he wants. He may be of a passionate nature, but his approach remains intellectual.

Poem 7 is obviously connected with poem 5. The theme of kisses (*quaeris, quot mihi basiationes | tuae, Lesbia, sint satis superque* 1-2) and the message of the last two lines (11-12 *quae nec pernumerare curiosi | possint nec mala fascinare lingua*). What then is the situation of this poem? Lesbia has asked Catullus how many kisses he wants, and we may perhaps sense a note of impatience (if Catullus was successful in gaining the *basia mille, deinde centum, | dein mille altera, dein secunda centum, | deinde usque altera mille, deinde centum* of 5.7-9). Poem 7 seems then designed to placate Lesbia, and presumably to persuade her into kissing him some more. He does this by means of far-fetched, high-flown comparisons, especially the first, with the number of sands in the Libyan desert, where he employs the rare and allusive word *lasarpicioferos*, 'silphium-bearing', and suggests Callimachus by the references to the oracle of Zeus Ammon and the tomb of Battus (3-6). This display of erudition was just the sort of thing that a *docta puella* would appreciate. The simpler comparison with the number of stars in the night-sky, which suggestively *furtiuos hominum uident amores* (7-8), indicates what Catullus will be satisfied with (9-10 *tam te basia multa basiare | uesano satis et super Catullo est*, where *satis et super* picks up the end of line 2 and what, if she wants to avoid ugly rumours, Lesbia had better give him (9-12). Catullus ultimate aim, as in poem 5, is passionate, but his approach is intellectual. He employs an erudite and witty method of persuading Lesbia, far from the romantic approach of tearing his hair, banging his head against the wall and grovelling abjectly at her feet.

The 'Lesbia' poetry of Catullus, then, tells us a great deal about the poet. There is little doubt that Catullus was an emotional man (it is hard to accept that Catullan poetry is all *persona* and no Catullus) and passionately involved with a woman, whoever she was, whom he called 'Lesbia'. But probable or even only just possible biographical information should not distract too much from the nature of the poems themselves.

Catullus was indebted to the Alexandrian tradition. This placed emphasis on polish,

finish, experimentation and exactness in metre, learned allusion, the rejection of epic and the development of new genres such as epyllion, with heroes and heroines who were psychologically plausible as compared with the impersonal style of the traditional epic. Such highly crafted epyllia were the major works that Catullus and his friends undertook, and if Catullus wanted to be remembered for anything it was probably his 'Peleus and Thetis'. The 'profuse strains of unpremeditated art' were not yet valid criteria for writing poetry.

Alexandrian poetry was poetry for the intellect and not for the heart. This makes it all the more remarkable that a poet who wrote in such a tradition should have become known as a 'poet of passion', and that the works that gained widest reading were concerned with his feeling for one woman. Yet Catullus was far from being simply a poet of 'primitive passion': even in his 'Lesbia' poems, such as 5 and 7, his approach remains intellectual, and in the poems where he struggles to free himself from Lesbia and from his own lingering feelings for her the tension in the poetry comes from the battle between his reason and his passion.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- | | |
|-------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Copley, F. O., 1951 | 'Catullus I. TAPA 82, 200-206. |
| Elder, J. P., 1966 | 'Catullus I, his poetic creed, and Nepos', <i>HSCP</i> 71, 143-9. |
| Frank, T., 1928 | <i>Catullus and Horace</i> , Oxford, Basil Blackwell. |
| Gould, G.P., 1973 | <i>Interpreting Catullus</i> , London, H.K.Lewis & Co. Ltd. |
| Havelock, E. A., 1939 | <i>The Lyric Genius of Catullus</i> , Oxford, Basil Blackwell. |
| Lyne, R. O. A. M., 1978 | 'The Neoteric Poets', <i>CQ</i> ns28, 167-187. |
| Neudling, C. L., 1955 | <i>A Prosopography to Catullus</i> , Iowa Studies in Classical Philology 12. |
| Quinn, K., 1962 | 'Docte Catulle', in J.P.Sullivan ed., <i>Critical Essays on Roman Literature, Elegy and Lyric</i> , London, 31-63. |
| 1972 | <i>Catullus: An Interpretation</i> , London, Batsford. |
| Ross, D. O., 1969 | <i>Style and Background in Catullus</i> , Cambridge, Mass.. |
| 1975 | <i>Backgrounds to Augustan Poetry: Gallus, Elegy & Rome</i> , Cambridge UP 1975. |
| Rudd, Niall, 1964 | 'The Style & the Man', <i>Phoenix</i> 18, 216-231. |
| Segal, Charles, 1970 | 'Catullan otiosi: The Lover & the Poet', <i>G&R</i> 17, 25-31 |
| Singleton, D., 1972 | 'A Note on Catullus' First Poem', <i>CP</i> 67, 192-196. |
| Wilkinson, L. P., 1974 | 'Ancient & Modern: Catullus li again', <i>G&R</i> 21, 82-85. |
| Wiseman, T. P., 1969 | <i>Catullan Questions</i> , Leicester UP. |
| 1985 | <i>Catullus and his World. A Reappraisal</i> , Cambridge UP. |
| Woodman, A. J., 1974 | 'Sleepless Poets: Catullus and Keats', <i>G&R</i> 21, 51-53. |

Copyright © 1990 T.Fear

Joan M. Frayn (Kingston upon Thames): *Quality control in Roman agriculture*

LCM 15.2 (Feb.1990), 24-26

It is well-known, but not entirely unremarkable, that in Diocletian's *Edict on Maximum Prices* the quality of fruit, vegetables and other items of farm produce, as well as livestock, is frequently indicated by descriptions such as *optimi*, *sequentes*, and by the phrases *primae formae* and *secundae formae*. Such classifications must have had their antecedents, and indeed some of them can be traced¹. They are a logical development from the maxims of the Roman agronomists, particularly Columella. Earlier, for example in Cato's *de agri cultura*, qualitative differences indicated were between produce fit for the master's table and

¹ An earlier example is to be found in Seneca, *Dialogi* 1.3.6, with reference to venison. Examples in the jurists may reflect a legal usage of these phrases established earlier, e.g. *Cod.úst.* 12.23.7, and *CTh.* 6.32.2. In each of these there is also a *forma tertia*.

that suitable for the slaves (such as the windfall olives in *de agr.* 58). This type of distinction of course continued to be made, and reappears in a different form in Juvenal, *Satire* 5 (e.g. regarding fruit, lines 149-155), where we hear of produce fit respectively for *patroni* and *clientes*. With the establishment of veteran colonies devoted to raising agricultural produce for the town market and *villae rusticae* managed by expert *vilici* and intended to make a profit for their owners from specialised agriculture, a new attitude to quality of produce appears. The word *vendibilis* ('saleable') finds a use in this context, as in Pliny, *NH* 14.42, where the grapes *quae forenses vocantur* are described as *vendibiles aspectu*, an idea taken up later by Isidore (*Etym.* 17.5.15, with echoes of Columella 3.2.1 & 2).

The descriptions of quality of the produce listed in the *Edict*² vary slightly with the product to which they apply. In 3.10, honey is *optimus*, and in the Greek *πρωτεῖος* or *δεύτερος*. In 6, which lists vegetables, we find (3) *intiba optima* and *sequentia*, but the Greek is still *πρωτεῖοι* and *δεύτεροι*. Mallows (5 & 6) are in the Latin *maximae* and *sequentes*, suggesting that the standard for these was based on size, but the Greek is unchanged. Most of the vegetables are listed under two qualities, but with *melopepones* we find size to be the criterion again (30), *maiores* in the Latin and *μεγδλοι* in the Greek. Dessert fruits such as peaches are also distinguished by size. Apples have three categories, *mala optima Mattiana sive Saligniana* (65), *sequentia* (66) and *mala minora* (67). This last heading must have referred to very inferior fruit, since the maximum price is to be 4 *denarii* for 40, exactly half that quoted for the 'second-class' apples. In Section 17 we find that animal fodder is not distinguished by quality at all.

In Section 30, *de pretio iumentorum*, the farm animals (breeding stock) are mostly quoted as *optimus* in Latin and *καλλιστος* in Greek. But items 15-20 are categorised as *formae primae*. This phrase, together with *formae secundae* is often used in other parts of the *Edict*, especially with reference to textiles. Both these qualities are quoted for the hides in Section 8, 1a & 22. This use of *forma* is clearly a Roman technical and bureaucratic term, and when it appears in Greek it is simply transliterated from the Latin in various ways (for the possible forms of it see S. Lauffer, *Diokletians Preisedikt*. Berlin 1970, p. 243). All these descriptions, but particularly those involving the use of numerals such as 'first' and 'second' quality suggest objective standards, though no doubt they were not always accurately applied. *Primae formae* and *secundae formae* in the *Edict* do not simply mean that the items thus described are the best or second-best on a particular estate or produced by an individual grower. They imply a common standard of judgement, an attempt by an aedile or an *ἀγορανόμος*. Without this it would in fact have been difficult to set up the regulation of market prices at all, at any rate in respect of foodstuffs.

There is further standardisation of agricultural produce involved when it is marketed, transported or used for table displays, whether in private houses or for celebrations held by clubs and *collegia*. The baskets of figs which appear in Romano-Campanian wall-paintings³ show all the fruit of standard size, just as it is produced for the supermarket trade today. There are also neat bundles of asparagus similar in length and number of stems to those on sale now, but some with a slenderness which is more characteristic of the wild varieties we know⁴. It could be argued that the fruit is all of equal size merely for the convenience of the artist portraying it, but if so this principle is not applied to other still-life paintings, such as those of game and fish. This standardisation not only goes hand in hand with an emphasis on quality, but it affects the varieties chosen by the grower, and this in turn is likely to result in further

² References to the *Edict on Maximum Prices*, where not otherwise specified, are to the edition of M. Giaccchero, Genoa 1974

³ Such as that found on the rear wall of the *triclinium* (14) at Oplontis; cf. the glass bowl of pomegranates from Room 23; apples in fruit bowl from the House of Julia Felix, Pompeii.

⁴ J. M. Croisille, *Les Natures mortes campaniennes*, Brussels 1965, Pl. 42, no. 83; Croisille suggests salsify for the bunch of vegetables in Pl. 20. 37, but again the standardisation is very clear, as also for the radishes and carrots in the same picture.

improvements. The lists compiled by Casella⁵ showing the number of varieties of each type of fruit mentioned by the Elder Pliny and by Columella offer an indication of this process. The largest number of varieties belong to those fruits which were commercially grown and marketed on a large scale in the period to which this survey relates. This is particularly noticeable in the case of the references in Columella, who does not concern himself with any special varieties of cherry, pomegranate, chestnut or medlar. These fruits were less important commercially, and pomegranates, chestnuts and medlars were often obtained from wild or 'protected' trees. If we are to believe Pliny, *NH* 15.102, dessert cherries were a late introduction into Italy.

In animal husbandry also it is probable that the same process of quality control through the markets was taking place during the period from approximately the middle of the 2nd century B.C to the third century A.D.. This explains the elaborate instructions for the feeding of stock which we find in the agronomists. Already in Cato's *de agri cultura* a variety of fodder plants are to be grown on the farm to feed the oxen (*de agr.* 27). Surplus dairy products are to be used in pig-rearing (150). Varro *RR.* 2.5.17) recommends that calves be fed on barley meals as well as bran and grass. The amounts of food for oxen in Columella's very detailed account are noteworthy, and he gives a great deal of attention to the subject (6.3.4-8), listing the types of food to be provided in each month of the year. He begins with January, when the oxen should have vetch soaked in water and mixed with chaff or lupins or chick-peas. In place of grain they can if necessary have twenty *modii* of dry foliage or thirty pounds of hay. They should also have acorns, and crushed beans if available on the farm. The food allowance is increased in march and April for the first ploughing. Leaves are important in the summer months, but are to be carefully chosen. In November and December *quantum appetit bos, tantum praebendum est* – for the period of the sowing. This is a varied, expensive and well-planned diet for working animals, intended to do much more than merely keep them alive: care is taken *ne penuria cibi macrescat pecus* (6.3.1)⁶. Even the different properties of the chaff are considered (6.3.3), and *iumenta* are to have barley as well. Columella is, however, always conscious of the need to balance the books, and advises the use of certain foodstuffs only when they are available on the farm itself or are cheap to buy (e.g. in 6.3.5, 7.3.22, 7.9.9, 8.4.1).

Pastio villatica also involves lavish feeding and high standards of care even for poultry, and it is clear that much of this produce, like the fruit and vegetables, is intended for the use of high-class caterers providing celebratory dinners – Columella 8.7.5 *antiquissimum est autem maximam quamque avem lautioribus epulis destinare. sic enim digna merces sequitur operam et impensam*. These are not the attitudes either of the 'small man' farming for mere subsistence or the landowner enjoying a rural retreat. Nor do they represent the 'glut and famine' view of agricultural economics so clearly expounded by Cicero (*in Verrem* 2.3.98) in relation to the contemporary Sicilian grain trade⁷. Rather they characterise the sophisticated 'agri-businessman' with an eye to standards of production as well as to the *annona macelli*.

Copyright © 1990 Joan M. Frayn

⁵ Domenico Casella, *La Frutte nelle Pitture pompeiane*, in *Pompeiana*, Naples 1950, p.380.

⁶ It is to these and similar maxims that S. Bökönyi refers in 'Animal Breeding on the Danube', in C.R. Whittaker (ed.), *Pastoral Economies in Classical Antiquity*, Cambridge 1988, when he writes (pp.171-2): 'It involved appropriate feeding in quantitative and qualitative respects . . .'

⁷ In *Verrem* 2.3.98.

uix credo tota auctione capiet quinquagesies
quinquagesies B¹: *quinquagies* B², *quinquagesae* CD, *quinquagesis* A.

Such is Messenio's dry comment on the value of Matrona in the second-last line of the play at the end of his advertisement of the forthcoming sale of Menaechmus' property in Epidamnus. The text is sound, and the meaning, 'I scarcely think she will fetch (*OLD capio* 8, 11) one five millionth of the whole sale', though that neglects an essential point depending on the order of words and morphemes that will be more accurately rendered below.

The form *quinquag-es-ies* is unique and has gravelled commentators, who if they believe it, have nothing better to suggest than that it is a 'vulgar' synonym for *quinquag-ies* (so already B²), which they cannot explain convincingly either.

Clearly the word must denote a very limited value for the wife: that should be obvious in itself and is the proper implication of *uix* (see below). But the numeral is a multiplicative adverb (*-ies*), and these are regularly used with *centum milia* understood to denote very large numbers, e.g. *quinquag-ies* (*centum milia*) 'fifty times a hundred thousand' = 5,000,000. This is most familiar in the reckoning of large sums of money in sesterces, but not exclusively (e.g. distances in paces) and has nothing in principle to do with the sesterce as currency-unit anyway. But any interpretation of *-esies* in the domain one to infinity is going to go in the wrong direction, overvaluing the wife, whatever the currency unit we assume and supply in the genitive with the noun *milia* implicit in this idiom. Besides, it is very doubtful whether in Plautus' time a large sum of money could be meaningfully expressed this way without specification of the currency unit (e.g. *denariûm*, *cistophorûm*, *philippûm*, certainly not *sestertiûm*, which only became current and standard from the middle of the 2nd century B.C.). The idea that *quinquagesies* is merely a 'vulgar' equivalent of *quinquagies* used *metri gratia* does not merit discussion. Plautus of all writers is not one to tolerate a lazy morpheme idling around while the rest are busy.

Leo's *quinquagesimas* (*partes*) cuts the knot and enters the right domain, the fractional world between nought and one: 'I scarcely think she will fetch fiftieth (parts), i.e. 2% in/by means of the whole auction'. But in that case we should expect the genitive (*totius*?) *auctionis*, rather than the ablative, the exact force of which remains unclear, as well as whether *tota* is in fact ablative or nominative; and this way there is in any case no accounting for the putative corruption of the familiar *-esimas* to the unfamiliar *-esies*.

The first inference to be drawn is that *quinquagesies* is correctly transmitted – well, nearly; for the *-aes* in ACD reflects some inept antique attempt to elicit 'bronze', and A at any rate is trying to sell us **quinquagessis aes* 'fifty asses, bronze'. But apart from the seventy three objections there are to that in terms of Latin grammar and the idioms of Roman business there is the fatal metrical objection that accented monosyllables are very unwelcome visitors at the ends of iambo-trochaic lines running out . . . *B c D* unless they be superimposed on the elided end of a long word that would by itself fill the cadence.

The second inference is morphological. Given that *N-ies* means 'N hundred thousand', then *N-es-ies* means 'N hundred thousand-*ths*'. The morpheme *-es-* corresponds to our *-th*, and the function of the ablative is multiplicative, cf. 680 *bis tanta*, etc.; this lends point to *tota* as ablative, N times the sale *as a whole*. Otherwise the nominative would have sufficient comic point, 'the wife entire', and since the word is elided, one wonders whether Plautus was not there having it both ways.

This interpretation of *-es-ies* in turn implies in theory at least a whole set of these 'reciprocals' denoting millionths: *dec-ies* 'one million', **dec-esies* 'one millionth'; *uic-ies* 'two million', **uic-esies* 'a two millionth'; . . . *mill-ies* 'a hundred million', **mill-esies* 'a hundred millionth'. Maybe they *were* in use; but it is hard to envisage a practical need for them in real Roman life, except in comic depreciation, as here.

Finally, the word- and morpheme-order. 'I hardly think she (whole?) in the whole sale will fetch *quin-qua*-' seems to promote 'five' to 'fifty', some largish absolute sum as a 'sensible' estimate; but '*gesi*-' rules that out, and must lead us to expect the conclusion '*-mas*', '2%', but the last syllable then defeats that expectation – not even '2%', but *-es*, 'a five millionth'. An appropriately precise arithmetical joke to conclude this most arithmetical of comedies. Evidently, therefore, the actor is to pronounce that last word very slowly as *quin-qua-gesi-es*. We cannot in English preserve the two apparent rises (*quin-qua*-) and two sharp falls (*-gesi-es*) implicit in this long word, but we can get three rises and one huge drop by rendering 'I scarcely think that by the sale entire she will fetch the five – hundred – thousand – th', leaving 'entire' ambiguously placed, and allowing '-th' to defeat expectation of 'mark'.

The writer is grateful to Dr. Pinsent for useful suggestions in the drafting of this note.

Copyright © 1989 A.S. Gratwick.

David Harvey(Exeter): *The silent woman of Lydia: Manisa Museum inv.5414 line 15*
LCM 15.2 (Feb.1990), 28-29

Χλωροτέρω καὶ τοῖς ἐν Σάρδεσιν (for Greenie and the excavators at Sardis)

In 'A New Confession-Inscription from the Katakekaumene', GRBS 28 (1987), 459-472, Georg Petzl and Hasal Malay publish an inscription recently discovered near Kula in Burnt Lydia, and now in the Archaeological Museum at Manisa, inv. 5414. The purpose of the present note is to propose a new restoration of the corrupt participle at the beginning of line 15; for all other matters readers should consult the original publication.

Theogenes lost a precious stone, and suspected his wife Syntyche of having stolen it. She prayed to the god Mēn Axiottēnos, who 'broke asunder' the real culprit, a girl called Apphia (presumably Apphia died, and was therefore believed to have been the thief). Apphia's mother (lines 15-17) asked Syntyche to keep quiet about this, and Syntyche agreed; but the god was angry with her for having failed to reveal his power (we are not told how he showed his anger), and compelled her to set up an inscribed account of the matter 'because she had acted in the interests of men rather than of the god'.

At lines 15 to 17 the stone reads ΠΕΡΙΚΙΥΡΟΥΣΗΣ τε αὐτῆς τὴν δύναμιν τοῦ | θεοῦ διὰ τὸ ἡρωτῆσθαι ὑπὸ τῆς μητρὸς | τῆς παρθένου, ἵνα σειγῇσι, 'when Syntycheed the power of the god, since she had been asked by the girl's mother to keep silent'. Petzl and Malay offer *περισυρούσης* for the meaningless ΠΕΡΙΚΙΥΡΟΥΣΗΣ, and translated 'because she slighted (or ridiculed) the god's power'.

This conjecture is open to two serious objections. First, the evidence for this sense of *περισύρω* is exceptionally tenuous: Eustathios 1816.46 uses the verb, and explains that 'the ancients' defined ridicule (*κωμῶδλαν*) as blame and *περίσυρμα*. No doubt he had good evidence, but no extant text ever uses the word in this sense: it is hardly even a *hapax*, more of a *hēmisisakis*.

Secondly, *περισυρούσης* produces a meaning that is inappropriate to the context. Apphia's mother asked Syntyche to keep quiet, so what does she do? She mocks the god – a curious way of hushing things up. If she had gone around making blasphemous remarks such as 'Silly old Mēn Axiottēnos, he had nothing to do with the death of Apphia', she would not have concealed the matter, but drawn attention to it.

Petzl and Malay (499 n.55) also mention Hermann's suggestion *περικρουούσης*, in the unique sense of 'because she put the god's power to the test'. This is open to my first objection, and gives a meaning that is, to say the least, unexpected.

It seems much more likely that ΠΕΡΙΚΙΥΡΟΥΣΗΣ is an error for *περικρυπτούσης*. The vertical hasta read by the editors as a second iota slightly exceeds the height of the line: the

mason occasionally inscribes the vertical of rho like this (e.g. in lines 5, 8 and perhaps 2), but not iota. It looks as if he was interrupted half-way through his rho, and on his return proceeded as if he had completed it: *περικρυ*. It is difficult to account for what happened next, another rho where we need *πρ*. Petzl and Malay's excellent photograph (their Plate I) shows some marks on the stone – which I have not seen – just to the right of the rho, but these I take to be scars rather than traces of a letter. Perhaps the mason remembered his half-finished rho (after an ouzo-break?), put one in, and completed the genitive participle regardless. Whatever happened, *περικρυπτούσης* is as close to *ΠΕΡΙΚΙΥΡΟΥΣΗΣ* as *περισυρούσης* and *περικρουούσης*.

Is the word adequately attested, and does it provide an acceptable meaning? LSJ translate *περικρύπτω* as 'to conceal entirely', and cite examples from the Gospel of Luke, Lucian and (in the middle voice) Diogenes Laertios, who provide a neat chronological bracket, since the date of the stone is probably between A.D. 150 and 250 (Petzl and Malay 459). And *περικρυπτούσης* gives us perfect sense at last: 'When Syntyche totally concealed the god's power, because she had been asked by the girl's mother to keep quiet'.

Copyright © 1990 David Harvey.

D. N. Levin (Rice U., Houston): dormitant commentatores Heliodori

LCM 15.2 (Feb.1990), 29

For two generations scholars interested in Heliodorus have found useful the three-volume Budé text of the *Aethiopica* edited and annotated (with additional notes from the translator, Jean Maillon) by Robert M. Rattenbury and the Rev. Thomas W. Lumb (Paris 1935 - 1937 - 1943: 2nd ed. 1960). And certainly Rattenbury and Lumb are sensitive to the likelihood that the novelist has borrowed heavily from earlier Greek literature, from epic and drama most particularly. Sometimes, however, they can point to no extant prototype; yet they find evidence of some sort of imitation in the choice of a seemingly poetic turn of phrase or even in the apparent introduction of a specific kind of poetic metre into the novel's prose-matrix.

Such is the case, for example, at *Aeth.* 5.33.4, where a literal or figurative conversion of wine into tears is at issue. Rattenbury and Lumb see the last three vocables of *ἐπιφορον γὰρ τι πρὸς δάκρυον οἶνος* as possibly the back end of a dactylic hexameter. Moreover, while they grant the rightness of the thought, they question whether the thought could have originated with Heliodorus. And yet they are forced to confess that they can find a prototype in no ancient author whose work remains extant.

Would that Rattenbury and Lumb had been awake to the possibility that the author of the *Aethiopica*, just as the poet Horace back in early Imperial Rome, had profited from acquaintanceship with the fifth elegy of Tibullus, with lines 37f. thereof, to be more specific!

saepe ego temptavi curas depellere uino:

at dolor in lacrimas uerterat omne merum.

If I have understood aright, Horace's *nunc uino pellite curas* (*car.* 1.7.312), supposedly uttered by Teucer as he and his followers prepare to travel again, this time to seek a new homeland after the Trojan War, looks to the Tibullan hexameter, whereas Heliodorus' *πρὸς δάκρυον οἶνος*, despite its quasi-hexametric patterning, looks rather to the Tibullan pentameter, wherein the efficacy of wine as solace to the love-lorn is expressly denied and wherein the conversion, literal or figurative, of a desired liquid into another such as one would seek to avoid renders the lover's frustration all the starker.

Copyright © 1990 D.N. Levin

This article appeared in M. Whitby et al, eds., Homo Viator, 1988, but unfortunately without its final paragraph, which is now added here to the rest of the article, which is republished by kind permission of the Editor.

The *Iliad* is an epic of military discipline, conceived philosophically, as only those without academic philosophy can be philosophical. Achilles is, by destiny and inevitable choice¹, he who will not return home, that part of the youth of any man that may end on the battlefield. For this, he requires compensation, immediate sexual satisfaction, chosen from taken possessions, with the right to those possessions which constitutes his honour (τιμή): his good name (κλέος) he will win for himself. It is all he ultimately gains.

The epic anger arises from this consciousness², and the narrative of failure, destruction, and vindictiveness in the abuse of the body stretches to a complete exposition of this tension. The death is irrelevant, the compensations vital: what Achilles says of Agamemnon's depredation (Ιση μοῖρα μένοντι, καὶ εἰ μάλα τις πολεμίζοι, 9.318) is echoed by Odysseus in the *Hecuba* (306-16) of another sexual 'prize'³. The reference to staying at home is remembered by Euripides: it is, ironically, the probable motive for Odysseus' vicious revenge on Palamedes some seven years later in the lost tragedy of that name in 415 B.C.⁴. The symbolic satisfaction of the sacrifice of virgins, as prelude or afterpiece to ritual slaughter⁵, is only one of the expressions of this sexual tension: the song of the Sirens can only be heard by a man bound to the direction taken by his ship (*Od.* 12.165-200), or drowned by song (*Ap. Rhod. Arg.* 4.891-921), another compensation. These distractions from purpose are most stunningly expressed in the seductive allurements of Helen, imitating the voices of the wives at the moment of final cataclysm from the Wooden Horse (*Od.* 4.271-89). The purpose that keeps Odysseus silent and drives him home is the complement of the frustration of Achilles.

Furthermore, the rings around city and tomb that a sequestered son traces with the doomed and dead husband contrast with the vector, albeit erratic but intentional, of the father who has promise of a son. The communal walls exclude those who sleep hard, in the open, away from hearth, from sufficiency⁶; both house and ἀύλη contain these later domestic

¹ 9.412-5 (choice); 19.408-10, and 416-7 (destiny).

² In this respect, his heated reaction to Xanthos' prediction of this death – ἀλλὰ καὶ ἔμψης ἰοὺ λήξω πρὶν Τρώας ἄδην ἔλδοι πολέμοιο – is an exact corollary of his impassioned withdrawal of labour.

³ On the date of the *Hecuba*, see my observations in *Eranos*

⁴ The issue of burial, epic or dramatic, is too well known to need much emphasis: that it is tied, indirectly, to military discipline by Creon (*Soph. Ant.* 663-78) is often forgotten in Hegelian discussions of the play. The particular tension of the hoplite line is also expressed in resentment against the greater freedom of the archer, as typical of light-armed troops: for this, the detailed and pointed abuse of Heracles by Lykos (*Eur. HF.* 157-64) is rather more relevant than the sharp sneer at Teucer (*Soph. Aj.* 1120-23).

⁵ This becomes more explicit in tragedy: Achilles sacrifices young men (*Il.* 23.1755-7), but the list of young girls sacrificed, or of self-dedication, mounts steadily for tragedy, particularly, its would appear, in Euripides (*Heracle.*; *Hec.*; *Supp.*; the lost *Erechtheus*; *IA*; explicit reference in *Tro.* and *IT*), though Sophocles wrote an *Iphigenia* and *Polyxene*, as Aeschylus an *Iphigenia*, presumably before the *Oresteia*. On the sacrifice of virgins, see especially W. Burkert, *Homo Necans* (London and Los Angeles, 1983), ch. 7 'The Sexualisation of Ritual Killing: Maiden Sacrifice, Phallus Cult', 58-72, with the later pages of his earlier 'Greek Tragedy and Sacrificial Ritual', *GRBS* 7 (1966), 87-121. For all the power of his analysis, Burkert fails to emphasize the connection with discipline, preferring an accent on the ambivalent sexual-aggressive motives of both hunting and war. I feel this is a mistake; for I am doubtful if the careful organization of myth and poetry has a function primarily expressive of an historic, ritual reality such as he suggests.

⁶ The harshness of a lived reality is well understood by Aeschylus *Ag.* 551ff., and perceived dialectically by Euripides *Tro.* 370ff..

besiegers in comfort, an excess of indolent consumption marking a related extreme⁷. That the bow wastes both groups, as prelude and as finale, places both in the reach of a metaphor of disease⁸. The balance of a wife who is never a wife with one who is always so, both without husbands, can only be transcended by the wife who claims to be so falsely, and who by the careful enactment of that deceit removes the capacity of husband from that of fighting-man. Her net is that of Aphrodite and Ares⁹, plain to see, a challenge fundamentally subversive of any balance of possession or deprivation that epic may establish, a problematic that marks the true quality of drama, in a society susceptible above all others to the notion of 'problem'.

Copyright © 1988, 1990 Graham Ley.

S. Douglas Olson (Howard U., Washington D.C.): *Dicaeopolis and Aristophanes in Acharnians*

LCM 15.2 (Feb.1990), 31-32

In an article in this journal (LCM 13.7 [Jul.1988], 105-8), Dana Ferrin Sutton discussed the odd dramatic relationship between the hero Dicaeopolis and the comic poet Aristophanes at *Acharnians* 377-84, 497-507. He first reviews what he clearly believes is the inadequate modern critical response to these passages, and then offers a suggestion he apparently regards as original, that 'the actor playing Dicaeopolis was Aristophanes himself' (107). Fairness demands that the record be set straight on both counts.

That there is something particularly 'metatheatrical' about these lines is an observation at least as old as the Scholiast ad loc., who observes *ὡς ἀπὸ τοῦ προσώπου τοῦ ποιητοῦ ὁ λόγος* (ad 376) and *ὡς ἐκ τοῦ ποιητοῦ τοῦτο* (ad 501)¹. More recently, the close and troubling relationship between poet and hero throughout *Acharnians* has been the subject of a careful study by A. M. Bowie, which Sutton fails to cite or footnote². Perhaps more importantly, the suggestion that Aristophanes himself played Dicaeopolis is at least as old as Merry, in his Oxford edition of 1893, ad 377. The idea was also discussed by Starkie in his edition of 1909, and argued at length by Cyril Bailey over fifty years ago ('Who played "Dicaeopolis"?', in *Greek Poetry and Life: Essays presented to Gilbert Murray*, Oxford 1936, 231-240). As Haigh pointed out already in the late nineteenth century, however, the idea that the comic playwright

⁷ The architectural grasp of these composers is a firm product of the eighth century: see A. M. Snodgrass, *The Dark Ages of Greece*, Edinburgh 1971, on the fortifications at Smyrna, and the increased confidence in domestic building, esp. 434/6, in detail.

⁸ The smell of sulphur pervades the conclusion to the *Odyssey* (22).

⁹ The co-incidence of the display of two pairs of illicit lovers in successive plays, with this same *μηχάνημα* (Cho.981) associated in both cases, makes the interpretation of *ἀμφίβληστρον* as 'net' (Ag.1382, *ὥσπερ ἰχθύων*; Cho.492) unequivocal; that of Hephaistos is of finer stuff (Od.8.280), but, there again, it is designed not to be seen.

¹ On the problem of 'dramatic illusion' (or the lack thereof) in Attic Comedy, cf. especially G. M. Sifakis, *Parabasis and Animal Choruses* (London 1971); Frances Muecke, 'Playing with the Play: Theatrical Self-consciousness in Aristophanes', *Antichthon* 11 (1977), 52-67.

² A. M. Bowie, 'The Parabasis in Aristophanes: Prolegomena, *Acharnians*', *CQ* ns32 (1982), 27-40; cf. also E. L. Bowie, 'Who is Dicaeopolis', *JHS* 108 (1988), 183-5, which appeared shortly after Sutton's piece. Although it is true that 'Aristophanes' play and Dicaeopolis' treaty . . . are both responses to the same set of problems' (Bowie 31), many of the other similarities between the two that he develops (Bowie 29) are apparent only at those points where Dicaeopolis speaks specifically as the poet. The merger of the two personalities is thus the exception, and it lapses once it ceases to be constantly affirmed. K. J. Dover originally argued that Dicaeopolis is to be understood only as a generic comic hero in 'Notes on Aristophanes' *Acharnians*', *Maia* 15 (1963), 15. Cf. the comments of G. E. M. de Ste Croix, *The Origins of the Peloponnesian War*, London 1972, 364.

was also an actor seems to be based only on a scholiast's misunderstanding of a didascalie note³. The Merry-Starkie-Bailey-(Sutton) hypothesis has accordingly been routinely rejected by modern commentators⁴. The most recent specialized work on the early stages of the poet's theatrical career, in fact, ignores it completely⁵.

We can be grateful to Sutton for calling our attention once again to a powerful if enigmatic scene in Aristophanes' earliest extant comedy. If credit it to be given where credit is due, however, let us acknowledge that secondary scholarship has given these passages far more serious consideration than Sutton implies, and that his 'new' approach to the text was proposed long ago by earlier generations, on whose shoulders we continue (albeit often unconsciously) to stand.

Copyright © 1990 S.Douglas Olson

M. R. Wright (Reading): *New wine in new bottles: Cicero de finibus 3.4.15*

LCM 15.2 (Feb.1990), 32

*nam cum in Graeco sermone haec ipsa quondam rerum nomina nouarum ** non uidebantur, quae nunc consuetudo triuit; quid censes in Latino fore?*

nouarum non uidebantur A, *uocarunt non uidebantur* BE, *nouarum nouabantur* Orellius; *triuit: tenuit* BE.

Post *nouarum* excidisse aliqua uerba suspicatur Madvig (Martha, Budé). He suggests *quondam rerum nomina nouarum* <*noua erant, ferenda*> *non uidebantur*, or *quondam nomina nouarum* <*noua erant, ferenda*> *non uidebantur*, or *quondam nomina* <*noua erant,*> *ridebantur*.

No lacuna need be suspected, and the suggestions for infilling are unnecessary. For *non* read *noua*, and change the semi-colon after *triuit* to a comma. The second syllable of *noua* would easily have been lost before the following *uidebantur*, especially with *nouarum* preceding; *non* in the normal abbreviated form would then have been assumed. So:

nam cum in Graeco sermone haec ipsa quondam rerum nomina nouarum noua uidebantur, quae nunc consuetudo triuit; quid censes in Latino fore?

with the sense

'For when even in Greek these terms for strange concepts once seemed strange. which constant use has now made routine, what do you think will happen in Latin?'

Copyright © 1990 M. R. Wright

³A. E. Haigh, *The Attic Theatre*, Oxford 1889. Curiously, Sutton (108) ends up rejecting this one fragile piece of evidence for Aristophanes as actor, insisting that Aristophanes instead played the part of the Sausage-Seller in *Knights*.

⁴ Cf. esp. the comments of Carlo Fernando Russo, *Aristofane Autore di Teatro*, Firenze 1962, 59-61. The idea is also rejected out of hand by de Ste Croix (op. cit. 364), Lowell Edmunds, 'Aristophanes' *Acharnians*, YCS 26 (1980), 9, Bowie (op. cit. 29 n.16), and Helen P. Foley, 'Tragedy and Politics in Aristophanes' *Acharnians*, JHS 108 (1988), 33 (which appeared after Sutton's piece). Sutton's dogmatic insistence (107) that 'it was normal for playwrights to act in their own plays' is not supported by the evidence (cf. Haigh 205, Bailey 235).

⁵ Stephen Halliwell, 'Aristophanes' Apprenticeship', CQ ns30 (1980), 33-45; Douglas M. MacDowell, 'Aristophanes and Kallistratos', CQ ns32 (1982), 21-26. Giuseppe Mastromarco, 'L'esordio "segreto" di Aristofane', Quaderni di storia 10 (July-December 1979), 153-196, simply notes that 'contro l'ipotesi di Bailey decisive sono le argomentazioni addotte da Russo' (190 n.27). Aristophanes discusses the stages in his career in metaphorical terms at *Knights* 512-16, *Wasps* 1016-22, without any obvious references to personal appearances on the stage. Sutton's question (108 n.11) as to how and whether the audience would know that Aristophanes (and not the producer Callistratus) was the author has been considered in exhaustive detail by Halliwell (35-41); for an alternative view, cf. MacDowell 23-26.